

Incompatibility of Self-Charge Conjugation with Helicity Eigenstates and Gauge Interactions

Dharam V. Ahluwalia

Mail Stop H-846, P-11, Nuclear and Particle Physics Research Group

Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA

Internet address: AV@LAMPF.LANL.GOV

Abstract

In this essay, an *ab initio* study of the self/anti-self charge conjugate $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space is presented. Incompatibility of self/anti-self charge conjugation with helicity eigenstates and gauge interactions is demonstrated. Parity violation is seen as an intrinsic part of the self/anti-self charge conjugate construct. From a phenomenological point of view, an essential part of the theory is the Bargmann-Wightman-Wigner-type boson, where a boson and its antiboson carry opposite relative intrinsic parity.

To establish a context, let us begin with the question: Why doesn't the mirror reflection of the ordinary β -decay, $n \rightarrow p + e^- + \nu_\beta$, exist in the nature? If the β -decay neutrino, ν_β , is assumed to be the standard Dirac or Majorana [1–3] particle, then kinematical considerations give no direct hint to the answer. We say “direct,” because the fact that a Majorana particle carries imaginary intrinsic parity [2,3] does indeed hint at parity violation if ν_β is assumed to be a Majorana particle. The canonical answer to the posed question lies in the dynamical considerations, i.e., the $V - A$ Lorentz structure of the interaction Lagrangian density. An equivalent kinematical answer is that the parity-transformed β -decay does not exist because ν_β is a right-handed Weyl (anti-) particle.

As there may exist phenomena beyond the standard model's $V - A$ Lorentz structure¹, we undertake an *ab initio* investigation of the self/anti-self charge conjugate structure of the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space. We find that the self/anti-self charge conjugate construct contains a similar kinematical asymmetry to the Weyl particles, *but* while for the massless case the Weyl particles must be in definite helicity eigenstates, the self/anti-self charge conjugate description precludes definite helicity eigenstates. States of definite helicity can be obtained by applying the projector $2^{-1} (1 \pm \gamma^5)$ to the self/anti-self charge conjugate construct. However, such a projection is incompatible with the requirement of self/anti-self charge conjugacy. This line of argument for

¹For example, Fetscher, Gerber, and Johnson [4], while studying normal and inverse muon decay, concluded that “present experimental errors still allow substantial contributions from interactions other than $V - A$.” In addition, existence of the solar neutrino deficit [5], the anomalous structure in the β -decay of gaseous molecular tritium [6] (or the “negative mass squared” problem) and other similar experiments [7], the possibility of neutrinoless double β -decay [8], neutrino oscillations from one species to another [9], and the tentative experimental evidence for a tensor coupling in the $\pi^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \gamma$ decay [10] all encourage a deeper look at fundamental theoretical constructs that may have relevance to the neutrinos and their interaction with matter. While these remarks hint at the possibility of yet undiscovered theoretical realms, they are not intended to shadow the remarkable experimental confirmation of the standard model predictions [11].

the physics beyond the standard model raises the possibility of identifying the β -decay neutrino (and other neutrinos ²) with this new structure in the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space. Strictly within the framework of the $V - A$ Lorentz structure of the electroweak interactions nothing phenomenologically new emerges from our study. Therefore, the construct presented here is of interest, first, in its own right and, second, for the physics beyond the standard $V - A$ Lorentz structure of the Glashow-Salam-Weinberg model.

Following Wigner's classic 1939 paper [12], we begin with the well-appreciated observation that without reference to any wave equation, it can be shown that the $(1/2, 0)$ and $(0, 1/2)$ spinors transform, see, e.g., Refs. [13–15], as

$$(1/2, 0) : \quad \phi_R(p^\mu) = \Lambda_R(p^\mu \leftarrow \hat{p}^\mu) \phi_R(\hat{p}^\mu) = \exp\left(+\frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}\right) \phi_R(\hat{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (1a)$$

$$(0, 1/2) : \quad \phi_L(p^\mu) = \Lambda_L(p^\mu \leftarrow \hat{p}^\mu) \phi_L(\hat{p}^\mu) = \exp\left(-\frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}\right) \phi_L(\hat{p}^\mu) \quad . \quad (1b)$$

In the above expressions, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ are the standard spin-1/2 matrices of Pauli, and $\hat{p}^\mu$ refers to the energy-momentum four vector associated with the particle at rest. The boost parameter $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ is defined as

$$\cosh(\varphi) = \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v^2}} = \frac{E}{m}, \quad \sinh(\varphi) = v\gamma = \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{m}, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} = \frac{\mathbf{p}}{|\mathbf{p}|} \quad . \quad (2)$$

Under the operation of parity, $\mathcal{P}$: $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \rightarrow -\boldsymbol{\varphi}$, while $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Therefore, the operation of parity interchanges the $(1/2, 0)$ and $(0, 1/2)$ representation spaces. In order that the theory is manifestly parity-covariant, one introduces the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space Dirac spinor:

$$\psi(p^\mu) := \begin{pmatrix} \phi_R(p^\mu) \\ \phi_L(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix} \quad . \quad (3)$$

These spinors (3) have the property that under charge conjugating them twice, they return to themselves.

²A *priori* it is not obvious that neutrinos involved in different processes be either self/anti-self charge conjugate or be of the Dirac type exclusively. Experiments should be suggested to explore the complex set of theoretical possibilities that neutrino physics offers.

We now systematically introduce spinors in the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space that are self/anti-self charge-conjugate. Following Ramond [16] and our recent work [17] on Majorana-like fields, if one notes that

a) the boosts for the $(1/2, 0)$ and $(0, 1/2)$ spinors have the property

$$\left[\Lambda_{L,R}(p^\mu \leftarrow \overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \right]^{-1} = \left[\Lambda_{R,L}(p^\mu \leftarrow \overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \right]^\dagger, \quad (4)$$

b) the Wigner's time reversal operator $\Theta_{[j]}$ for spin-1/2

$$\Theta_{[1/2]} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

has the important property

$$\Theta_{[1/2]} [\boldsymbol{\sigma}/2] \Theta_{[1/2]}^{-1} = - [\boldsymbol{\sigma}/2]^* ; \quad (6)$$

then it follows that

- c) if ϕ_L transforms as a $(0, 1/2)$ spinor, then $\left(\zeta \Theta_{[1/2]} \right)^* \phi_L^*(p^\mu)$ transforms as a $(1/2, 0)$ spinor, and
- d) if ϕ_R transforms as a $(1/2, 0)$ spinor, then $\left(\zeta' \Theta_{[1/2]} \right)^* \phi_R^*(p^\mu)$ transforms as a $(0, 1/2)$ spinor.

In the above expressions, ζ and ζ' are arbitrary phase factors. As such, exploiting the fact that $\Theta_{[1/2]} = \Theta_{[1/2]}^*$ we can also write, for convenience (and to stay as close as possible to existing literature [16,17]), $\left(\zeta \Theta_{[1/2]} \right)^* \phi_L^*(p^\mu)$ as $\left(\zeta'' \Theta_{[1/2]} \right) \phi_L^*(p^\mu)$.

The observations (c) and (d) made above imply that we can introduce, in addition to the Dirac spinors (3), the following spinors in the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space:

$$\lambda(p^\mu) := \begin{pmatrix} \left(\zeta_\lambda \Theta_{[1/2]} \right) \phi_L^*(p^\mu) \\ \phi_L(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(p^\mu) := \begin{pmatrix} \phi_R(p^\mu) \\ \left(\zeta_\rho \Theta_{[1/2]} \right)^* \phi_R^*(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

In order to distinguish between the $(\zeta_\lambda \Theta_{[1/2]}) \phi_L^*(p^\mu)$, $(\zeta_\rho \Theta_{[1/2]})^* \phi_R^*(p^\mu)$, and $\phi_R(p^\mu)$, $\phi_L(p^\mu)$, respectively, it is important to note that if $\phi_R(p^\mu)$ and $\phi_L(p^\mu)$ are specified in a right-handed coordinate system, $\mathcal{R}$, then the spinors $(\zeta_\lambda \Theta_{[1/2]}) \phi_L^*(p^\mu)$, $(\zeta_\rho \Theta_{[1/2]})^* \phi_R^*(p^\mu)$ belong to a left-handed $\mathcal{L}$ coordinate system. So, to be precise, the Dirac spinors, (3), are in the $(1/2, 0)_{\mathcal{R}} \oplus (0, 1/2)_{\mathcal{R}}$ representation space, while $\lambda(p^\mu)$ belongs to $(1/2, 0)_{\mathcal{L}} \oplus (0, 1/2)_{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ to the $(1/2, 0)_{\mathcal{R}} \oplus (0, 1/2)_{\mathcal{L}}$ representation space. Having made this observation, we shall drop the left/right-handedness identifying indices. However, the context should immediately make the implicit indices apparent in most situations.

After these essential cautionary remarks, we now return to the logical development of the self/anti-self charge conjugate $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space. The undetermined phase factors ζ_λ and ζ_ρ are fixed by demanding that $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ be self/anti-self charge-conjugate:

$$\lambda^\theta(p^\mu) = \pm \lambda(p^\mu) , \quad \rho^\theta(p^\mu) = \pm \rho(p^\mu) . \quad (8)$$

To implement the requirement (8), we note that given a $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ spinor, *not* necessarily Dirac, in Weyl (also known as chiral) representation,

$$\chi(p^\mu) := \begin{pmatrix} \chi_R(p^\mu) \\ \chi_L(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (9)$$

constructed out of a $\chi_R(p^\mu)$ that transforms as a $(1/2, 0)$ spinor and $\chi_L(p^\mu)$ that transforms as a $(0, 1/2)$ spinor, the phase factor ξ that appears in the operation of charge conjugation in the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space³:

$$\chi^\theta(p^\mu) := \begin{pmatrix} (\xi \Theta_{[1/2]}) \chi_L^*(p^\mu) \\ (\xi \Theta_{[1/2]})^* \chi_R^*(p^\mu) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (10)$$

³This way of introducing charge conjugation is entirely consistent with the charge conjugation introduced in more conventional ways [18]. However, the two operations differ by a relative phase factor. Our choice here has been dictated by conformity with the existing literature on our present subject — see Eq. 1.4.50 of Ref. [16], etc. To avoid any possible confusion that can otherwise arise with the previous works, we have denoted the charge conjugation in (10) by θ .

is fixed by demanding

$$\left[\chi^\theta(p^\mu)\right]^\theta = \chi(p^\mu) \quad . \quad (11)$$

The requirement (11) determines $\xi = i$, and the condition (8) then fixes $\zeta_\lambda^S = i = \zeta_\rho^S$ for the self charge-conjugate spinors $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ and $\rho^S(p^\mu)$; and $\zeta_\lambda^S = -i = \zeta_\rho^S$ for the anti-self charge-conjugate spinors $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ and $\rho^A(p^\mu)$. Parenthetically, for later reference, the operation of charge conjugation introduced via Eqs. (10) and (11) can also be written as

$$\mathcal{C} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \Theta_{[1/2]} \\ -i \Theta_{[1/2]} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{K} \quad , \quad (12)$$

where the operator $\mathcal{K}$ complex conjugates any c-number valued function to its right. In this notation: $\chi^\theta(p^\mu) := \mathcal{C} \chi(p^\mu)$.

Historically, the spinors $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ first appeared in the 1957 papers of McLennan [19] and Case [20] and are now found in several textbooks [16]; they are sometimes called Majorana spinors. No detailed properties of these spinors seem to have been investigated in the literature. We do not know of any existing literature where the $\rho(p^\mu)$ and the anti-self charge-conjugate spinors appear. This additional structure is necessary for completeness, in the mathematical sense, to span the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space. In the present framework, a physically satisfactory theory cannot be constructed without incorporating $\rho^S(p^\mu)$, or the anti-self charge-conjugate spinors $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$, in conjunction with $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$. It should be explicitly noted, to avoid confusion ⁴, that the $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ constructs are valid for massless as well as massive particles. In the context of the helicity operator for the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space:

⁴Cf., Marshak *et al.* [21] when they write “Thus, any massless spinor $\psi(x)$ can be represented as

$$\psi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \xi(x) \\ \sigma_2 \xi^*(x) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\xi(x)$ satisfies the 2-component Weyl Eq.”

$$h := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \end{pmatrix} , \quad (13)$$

the $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ spinors are endowed with the following, somewhat unexpected, properties:

1. The $\lambda(p^\mu)$ spinors cannot describe helicity eigenstates.
2. The $\rho(p^\mu)$ spinors cannot describe helicity eigenstates.
3. The superposition of $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ spinors

$$\chi(p^\mu) := a \lambda(p^\mu) + b \rho(p^\mu) \quad , \quad (14a)$$

constrained to satisfy the condition of self [or anti-self] charge conjugacy

$$\chi^\theta(p^\mu) = \chi(p^\mu) \quad , \quad [\text{or } \chi^\theta(p^\mu) = -\chi(p^\mu)] \quad , \quad (14b)$$

cannot describe helicity eigenstates.

That is, the self/anti-self charge-conjugate spinors in the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space cannot describe particles with definite helicity. Since the first two assertions follow as a special case of the last assertion, we now prove the third assertion made above. In the following proof, we shall confine to self charge-conjugate spinors. The proof for the anti-self charge-conjugate spinors runs along similar lines. One way to prove this theorem is to show that it is *not* possible to find non-null Weyl spinors $\phi_L(p^\mu)$ and $\phi_R(p^\mu)$ such that:

$$h \chi(p^\mu) = \pm \frac{1}{2} \chi(p^\mu) \quad . \quad (15)$$

To proceed with this exercise, identify $i \Theta_{[1/2]}$ with σ_2 and ⁵ then rewrite Eq. (15) explicitly as a set of two equations:

⁵In general, we refrain from making this identification so that extension of our construct to higher spins remains obvious.

$$a \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \sigma_2 \phi_L^*(p^\mu) + b \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \phi_R(p^\mu) = \pm \left[a \sigma_2 \phi_L^*(p^\mu) + b \phi_R(p^\mu) \right] \quad , \quad (16a)$$

$$a \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \phi_L(p^\mu) - b \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \sigma_2 \phi_R^*(p^\mu) = \pm \left[a \phi_L(p^\mu) - b \sigma_2 \phi_R^*(p^\mu) \right] \quad . \quad (16b)$$

Using $(\sigma_2)^2 = \mathbb{1}$, we replace $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \phi_L(p^\mu)$, which appears in the first term on the *lhs* of Eq. (16b) by $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \sigma_2 \phi_L(p^\mu)$; next, left-multiply the resulting equation by σ_2 and exploit the identity $\sigma_2 \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma_2 = -\boldsymbol{\sigma}^*$; finally taking the complex conjugate of the resulting equation, noting that the condition (14b) requires the a and b that appear in (14a) to be real, and after appropriate rearrangement, we rewrite Eq. (16b) as

$$a \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \sigma_2 \phi_L^*(p^\mu) + b \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \phi_R(p^\mu) = \mp \left[a \sigma_2 \phi_L^*(p^\mu) + b \phi_R(p^\mu) \right] \quad . \quad (17)$$

Comparing Eq. (16a) with the above equation, we immediately realize that the eigenvalue equation (15) is satisfied only if $a = 0 = b$ (or, equivalently if $\phi_L(p^\mu)$ and $\phi_R(p^\mu)$ are null spinors). This is what we set out to prove. That is, unlike the Weyl and Dirac spinors, the self/anti-self charge-conjugate spinors cannot be in helicity eigenstates. Since the right-hand sides of (16a) and (17) do not vanish in general for $m = 0$, the description of particles in terms of the self/anti-self charge-conjugate construct precludes definite helicity eigenstates for massive as well as massless particles. This result can also be seen as a consequence of the non-commutativity of the helicity operator and the operation of charge conjugation, $[h, \mathcal{C}] \neq 0$. The fact that Dirac spinors can be in helicity eigenstates is related with: $[h, \mathcal{C}^2] = 0$.

The reader should also take note of the fact that $(\zeta_\lambda \Theta_{[1/2]}) \phi_L^*(p^\mu)$ and $\phi_R(p^\mu)$ transform in an identical manner under Lorentz transformations, which does not necessarily imply that they transform identically under other transformations (such as parity, time reversal, and charge conjugation). Similar comments are valid for $(\zeta_\rho \Theta_{[1/2]})^* \phi_R^*(p^\mu)$ and $\phi_L(p^\mu)$. These observations acquire physical relevance when we consider the operation of parity on the $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$. The remarkable difference between Dirac spinors and $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$ spinors under the parity transformation, to be studied in due course, arises from this fact. Of course, this difference is also manifested in the different charge conjugation properties of the two $[\psi(p^\mu)$ versus $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(p^\mu)$] classes of spinors

In view of the theorem proved above, the reader may legitimately ask what happens to the self/anti-self charge-conjugate particles of the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space when they are made to pass through the Stern-Gerlach type apparatus. Can one not thus prepare the self/anti-self charge-conjugate particles of the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space in helicity eigenstates? The answer to this apparently paradoxical question is that the self/anti-self charge-conjugate particles of the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space have no electric-type (gauge-) charge, or electric/magnetic-type moment — by construction! As a consequence, the self/anti-self charge-conjugate particles of the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space just pass through Stern-Gerlach type setups without interacting with the field gradients. We shall return to the incompatibility of self/anti-self charge conjugation with gauge interactions after further development of the formalism.

The projected spinors,

$$\lambda_{\pm}(p^{\mu}) := \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{1} \pm \gamma^5) \lambda(p^{\mu}) , \quad \rho_{\pm}(p^{\mu}) := \frac{1}{2} (\mathbb{1} \pm \gamma^5) \rho(p^{\mu}) , \quad (18)$$

can be put into helicity eigenstates. As already indicated, the projection by $P_{\pm} := 2^{-1} (\mathbb{1} \pm \gamma^5)$ is incompatible with the requirement of self/anti-self charge conjugacy. The projectors $P_{\pm}$ and the operation of charge conjugation do not commute: $[P_{\pm}, \mathcal{C}] \neq 0$.

Having defined and studied some of the formal properties of the $\lambda(p^{\mu})$ and $\rho(p^{\mu})$ spinors, we now obtain their explicit expression. Towards this end, the rest spinors $\lambda^S(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu})$ and $\lambda^A(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu})$ can be written as (with similar expressions for the $\rho(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu})$ spinors)

$$\lambda^S(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu}) = \begin{pmatrix} i \Theta_{[1/2]} \phi_L^*(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu}) \\ \phi_L(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu}) \end{pmatrix} , \quad \lambda^A(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu}) = \begin{pmatrix} -i \Theta_{[1/2]} \phi_L^*(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu}) \\ \phi_L(\overset{\circ}{p}^{\mu}) \end{pmatrix} . \quad (19)$$

Even though $\lambda^S(p^{\mu})$ and $\lambda^A(p^{\mu})$ cannot be eigenstates of the helicity operator (13), the theorem proved above implies that $\lambda^S(p^{\mu})$ and $\lambda^A(p^{\mu})$ can be eigenstates of the

⁶After this work was completed, we learned that observations similar to the one contained in this paragraph were made independently and previously by Marshak *et al.* [21].

$$\eta := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \end{pmatrix} . \quad (20)$$

Because of the identity

$$\eta = -\gamma^5 h , \quad \gamma^5 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} , \quad (21)$$

we shall call this operator the “chiral helicity operator” and its eigenvalues “chiral helicities”.

To construct $\lambda^S(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$ and $\lambda^A(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$, which are eigenstates of the chiral helicity operator, we choose $\phi_L(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$ to be eigenstates of $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) = \pm \phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \quad (22)$$

In the above equation, $\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu$ is to be understood as $p^\mu = (m, \mathbf{p} \rightarrow \mathbf{0})$. Given (22), appropriate use of identity (6) implies

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}} \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)]^* = \mp \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)]^* . \quad (23)$$

That is, if $\phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$ are eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}$, then $\Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)]^*$ are eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{p}}$ with *opposite* eigenvalues to those associated with $\phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$. Referring to (19), we now introduce four rest spinors

$$\lambda_\uparrow^S(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} i \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^+(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)]^* \\ \phi_L^+(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \end{pmatrix} , \quad \lambda_\downarrow^S(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} i \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^-(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)]^* \\ \phi_L^-(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (24a)$$

$$\lambda_\uparrow^A(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} -i \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^+(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)]^* \\ \phi_L^+(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \end{pmatrix} , \quad \lambda_\downarrow^A(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} -i \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^-(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)]^* \\ \phi_L^-(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \end{pmatrix} . \quad (24b)$$

The subscripts $\uparrow$ and $\downarrow$ correspond to $\lambda(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$ constructed out of $\phi_L^+(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$ and $\phi_L^-(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$, respectively, and are to be interpreted as chiral helicities. Similar expressions as (24a) and (24b), of course, can be written down for $\rho(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)$. We will see that $\lambda(p^\mu) := \{\lambda^S(p^\mu), \lambda^A(p^\mu)\}$ and $\rho(p^\mu) := \{\rho^S(p^\mu), \rho^A(p^\mu)\}$ each form a complete set (in the mathematical sense). For the remainder of this paper, we shall mostly concentrate on the $\lambda(p^\mu)$. The mathematical content and physical results for $\rho(p^\mu)$ may be obtained in a parallel fashion.

The $\lambda(p^\mu)$ are now obtained using the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ Wigner boost implicit in Eqs. (1a) and (1b),

$$\lambda(p^\mu) = W(p^\mu \leftarrow \mathring{p}^\mu) \lambda(\mathring{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W(p^\mu \leftarrow \mathring{p}^\mu) &:= \begin{pmatrix} \exp(+\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}/2) & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(-\boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}/2) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \left(\frac{E+m}{2m} \right)^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} + (E+m)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1} - (E+m)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p} \end{pmatrix} . \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

For the sake of completeness, let us note parenthetically that the Wigner boost and the charge-conjugation operator commute: $[W(p^\mu \leftarrow \mathring{p}^\mu), \mathcal{C}] = 0$. Explicit expressions for $\lambda(p^\mu)$, obtained by applying $W(p^\mu \leftarrow \mathring{p}^\mu)$ to the rest spinor and exploiting Eqs. (22) and (23), read:

$$\lambda_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) = \left(\frac{E+m}{2m} \right)^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \{1 - (E+m)^{-1} |\mathbf{p}|\} i \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^+(\mathring{p}^\mu)]^* \\ \{1 - (E+m)^{-1} |\mathbf{p}|\} \phi_L^+(\mathring{p}^\mu) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (27a)$$

$$\lambda_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = \left(\frac{E+m}{2m} \right)^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \{1 + (E+m)^{-1} |\mathbf{p}|\} i \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^-(\mathring{p}^\mu)]^* \\ \{1 + (E+m)^{-1} |\mathbf{p}|\} \phi_L^-(\mathring{p}^\mu) \end{pmatrix} . \quad (27b)$$

The expressions for the anti-self charge-conjugate spinors $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ are obtained by replacing $i \Theta_{[1/2]}$ by $-i \Theta_{[1/2]}$ in the above expressions and at the same time replacing $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ by $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ without changing the chiral helicity index.

If we restrict ourselves to the physically acceptable norms, N , for $\phi^\pm(p^\mu)$ such that for *massless* particles, all *rest*-spinors vanish (for, massless particles can not be at rest)⁷; then, an inspection of $\lambda(p^\mu)$ given by Eqs. (27a) and (27b) immediately reveals that for massless particles there exists a kinematical asymmetry for the self/anti-self charge-conjugate spinors in the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space. For massless particles, $\lambda_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu)$ and $\lambda_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu)$ identically vanish. However, this vanishing should not be associated with the norm we have chosen. The norm simply avoids the

⁷A convenient choice [15,22] satisfying this requirement is $N = \sqrt{m} \times (\text{phase factor})$.

unphysical and singular norm of the massless spinors. The physical origin of this asymmetry lies in the fact that $\{\mathbb{1} + (E + m)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}\}$, which appears in the Wigner boost (26), acting on $\Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^+(\hat{p}^\mu)]^*$, a factor that originates from the requirement of self/anti-self charge conjugacy, on exploiting the identity (23), which has its origin in the very specific property (6) of the Wigner's time reversal operator, conspire to yield $\{\mathbb{1} - (E + m)^{-1} |\mathbf{p}|\} \Theta_{[1/2]} [\phi_L^+(\hat{p}^\mu)]^*$, that for the massless case vanishes. For the similarly constructed Dirac spinors (3), either the top two or the bottom two entries in the spinor (in the Weyl representation) vanish for $m = 0$.

Similarly, it can be shown that $\rho_\downarrow^S(p^\mu)$ and $\rho_\downarrow^A(p^\mu)$ identically vanish for the massless particles. This vanishing and the associated kinematical asymmetry, for any physically acceptable norm, again arises from a fine interplay between Wigner's boost, $W(p^\mu \leftarrow \hat{p}^\mu)$, the Wigner's time reversal operator, $\Theta_{[1/2]}$, and the role of Wigner's time-reversal operator in the operation of charge conjugation $\mathcal{C}$.

Kinematical asymmetries similar to the one discussed in the last two paragraphs for spin one half also hold true for spin one [17] and higher. However, in the context of Ref. [17], the reader should be alerted to the fact that while fermions and bosons enjoy many similarities⁸, their descriptions in the $(j, 0) \oplus (0, j)$ representations space differ in some profound aspects.

The next level of explicitness, which brings out further details in the self/anti-self charge-conjugate construct in the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space, is obtained by considering the $\phi^\pm(\hat{p}^\mu)$ in their most general form:

$$\phi_L^+(\hat{p}^\mu) = N \exp(i\vartheta_1) \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) \exp(-i\phi/2) \\ \sin(\theta/2) \exp(i\phi/2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28a)$$

$$\phi_L^-(\hat{p}^\mu) = N \exp(i\vartheta_2) \begin{pmatrix} \sin(\theta/2) \exp(-i\phi/2) \\ -\cos(\theta/2) \exp(i\phi/2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28b)$$

⁸Such as a particle and its antiparticle in the $(j, 0) \oplus (0, j)$ representation space have *opposite* relative intrinsic parities. The foregoing is true for fermions as well as bosons because of a recent construction [15] of a Bargmann-Wightman-Wigner-type quantum field theory [23].

with similar expressions for $\phi_R^\pm(p^\mu)$. Here, θ and ϕ are the standard polar and azimuthal angles associated with $\mathbf{p}$. Using these forms for $\phi_R^\pm(p^\mu)$ in (27a) (27b), we find the (bi)-orthonormality relations tabulated in Table I.

By choosing $\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2 = 0$, or for convenience $\vartheta_1 = 0 = \vartheta_2$, as we shall in the rest of the paper (unless indicated specifically to the contrary), one immediately obtains a *bi*-orthogonal set of $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ and $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$

$$\bar{\lambda}_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) \lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) = 0 = \bar{\lambda}_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) \lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) , \quad \bar{\lambda}_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) \lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) = 2i N^2 = -\bar{\lambda}_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) \lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) , \quad (29a)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_{\eta'}^S(p^\mu) \lambda_{\eta''}^A(p^\mu) = 0 = \bar{\lambda}_{\eta'}^A(p^\mu) \lambda_{\eta''}^S(p^\mu) , \quad (29b)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) \lambda_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) = 0 = \bar{\lambda}_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) \lambda_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) , \quad \bar{\lambda}_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) \lambda_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) = -2i N^2 = -\bar{\lambda}_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) \lambda_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) ; \quad (29c)$$

with the associated completeness relation:

$$\frac{-1}{2i N^2} \left[\left\{ \lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) \bar{\lambda}_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) - \lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) \bar{\lambda}_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) \right\} - \left\{ \lambda_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) \bar{\lambda}_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) - \lambda_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) \bar{\lambda}_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) \right\} \right] = \mathbb{1} . \quad (30)$$

The norm of self/anti-self charge-conjugate spinors is not as simply related to the norm of $\phi_{L,R}^\pm(p^\mu)$ as for the Dirac spinors. This is directly related to the operation of complex conjugation on $\phi_{L,R}^\pm(p^\mu)$ in the definition of $\lambda(p^\mu)$ and $\rho(P^\mu)$ spinors. We bring to reader's attention the specific fashion in which the $\exp(\pm i \phi)$ factors have been chosen in Eqs. (28a) and (28b). It is *this* specific choice that considerably simplifies the overall norm and has the advantage that it treats the angle ϕ in as symmetrical a fashion as possible.

Parenthetically, we observe that if the $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ and $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ are transformed from the present Weyl representation to the Majorana representation,

$$\lambda^M(p^\mu) := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} + \sigma_2 & \mathbb{1} - \sigma_2 \\ -\mathbb{1} + \sigma_2 & \mathbb{1} + \sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} \lambda(p^\mu) , \quad (31)$$

then independent of the choice for ϑ_1 and ϑ_2 , the $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ become *real* and the $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ *imaginary*, with similar results remaining true for $\rho^S(p^\mu)$ and $\rho^A(p^\mu)$.

Next we define

$$\chi_R(p^\mu) := \wp_{S,A} \left(i \Theta_{[1/2]} \right) \phi_L^*(p^\mu), \quad (32)$$

where $\wp_{S,A}$ equals $+1$ for the self-charge conjugate $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ spinors and is -1 for the anti-self-charge conjugate $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ spinors; we then couple the transformation properties,

$$\chi_R(p^\mu) = \exp\left(+\frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}\right) \chi_R(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (33a)$$

$$\phi_L(p^\mu) = \exp\left(-\frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}{2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\varphi}\right) \phi_L(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (33b)$$

and the observation,

$$\left[\phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu)\right]^* = \Xi \phi_L^\pm(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (34)$$

where Ξ in the Weyl representation with $\vartheta_1 = 0 = \vartheta_2$ reads

$$\Xi = \begin{pmatrix} \exp(i\phi) & 0 \\ 0 & \exp(-i\phi) \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (35)$$

with the identity

$$\chi_R(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) = \wp_{S,A} \left(i\Theta_{[1/2]}\right) \Xi \phi_L(\overset{\circ}{p}^\mu) \quad , \quad (36)$$

to obtain ⁹ a wave equation for the $\lambda(p^\mu)$ spinors. The resulting wave equation reads:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -2m\Omega & i\wp_{S,A} [\Omega + \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}] \Theta_{[1/2]} \Xi [\Omega + \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}] \\ i\wp_{S,A} [\Omega - \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}] \Xi^{-1} \Theta_{[1/2]} [\Omega - \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \mathbf{p}] & -2m\Omega \end{pmatrix} \lambda(p^\mu) = 0 \quad , \quad (37)$$

where $\Omega = (E + m)\mathbb{1}$.

Even though the wave equation (37) is not in a manifestly Poincaré covariant form, by taking the determinant of the operator that acts on $\lambda(p^\mu)$ in Eq. (37), and setting it equal to zero, it is readily verified that $\lambda(p^\mu)$ are indeed associated with solutions that satisfy $E^2 = m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2$. Furthermore, a simple (if a bit lengthy) algebraic exercise immediately reveals that while $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ are the *positive* energy solutions with $E = +\sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}$, $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ are the *negative* energy solutions with

⁹This procedure is a simple generalization of the work of Ryder and an observation (with some non-trivial physical consequences [15] for relative intrinsic parities of particles and antiparticles) made in Refs. [15,24].

$E = -\sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}$. These observations then yield at least two distinct field theoretic descriptions of the particles described by $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ and $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$.

1. A *Dirac-like* field may be defined as ¹⁰

$$\nu^D(x) := \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2p_0} \sum_{\eta'=\uparrow,\downarrow} \left[\lambda_{\eta'}^S(p^\mu) a_{\eta'}(p^\mu) \exp(-i p \cdot x) + \lambda_{\eta'}^A(p^\mu) b_{\eta'}^\dagger(p^\mu) \exp(+i p \cdot x) \right] . \quad (39)$$

On exploiting the identities ($\vartheta_1 = 0 = \vartheta_2$, again),

$$\rho_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) = +i \lambda_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) , \quad \rho_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) = -i \lambda_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) , \quad (40a)$$

$$\rho_\uparrow^A(p^\mu) = -i \lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu) , \quad \rho_\downarrow^A(p^\mu) = +i \lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu) , \quad (40b)$$

the field (39) may be re-expressed in terms of other complete sets, such as $\{\rho^A(p^\mu), \rho^S(p^\mu)\}$ and $\{\lambda^S(p^\mu), \rho^S(p^\mu)\}$.

2. A *Majorana-like* field may be introduced by identifying $b_{\eta'}^\dagger(p^\mu)$ and $a_{\eta'}^\dagger(p^\mu)$ with each other and confining to only the self-charge conjugate set of spinors $\{\lambda^S(p^\mu), \rho^S(p^\mu)\}$,

$$\nu^M(x) := \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{2p_0} \sum_{\eta'=\uparrow,\downarrow} \left[\lambda_{\eta'}^S(p^\mu) c_{\eta'}(p^\mu) \exp(-i p \cdot x) + \rho_{\eta'}^S(p^\mu) c_{\eta'}^\dagger(p^\mu) \exp(+i p \cdot x) \right] . \quad (41)$$

The description of particles in terms of a Dirac-like field, $\nu^D(x)$, or a Majorana-like field, $\nu^M(x)$, contains an intrinsic kinematical asymmetry. Furthermore, the physical states, unless projected by the $2^{-1} (1 \pm \gamma^5)$ projectors, cannot be helicity eigenstates. This is in sharp contrast to the

¹⁰The creation and annihilation operators satisfy the general anticommutation relations:

$$\left\{ a_{\eta'}(p'^\mu), a_{\eta''}^\dagger(p''^\mu) \right\} = i (2\pi)^3 2p_0 \delta^3(\mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}'') \delta_{\eta', -\eta''} , \quad (38)$$

(where by definition, $-\uparrow = \downarrow$ and, $-\downarrow = \uparrow$) in accordance with the bi-orthogonal nature of relations (29a)-(29c).

standard Dirac and Majorana fields that are constructed from Dirac spinors (3). These latter fields contain no kinematical asymmetry and the physical states can exist in helicity eigenstates.

From a formal point of view the wave equation (37) may be put in the form $(\lambda^{\mu\nu} p_\mu p_\nu + m \lambda^\mu p_\mu - 2 m^2 \mathbb{1}) \lambda(p^\mu) = 0$. However, it turns out that $\lambda^{\mu\nu}$ and λ^μ do not transform as Poincaré tensors. Therefore, the operator that acts on $\lambda(p^\mu)$ in Eq. (37) carries only the indices of the $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space *without* the additional structure, which contains contraction[s] of a Poincaré tensor[s] with an energy momentum four vector[s] p_μ . This has the consequence that gauge interactions cannot be introduced by replacing the ∂_μ by an appropriate gauge-covariant derivative.

Another simple way to see the incompatibility of gauge interactions and the $\nu(x)$ field introduced above is to explicitly note that the requirement of covariance under the simultaneous transformations $\phi_R(p^\mu) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha(x)} \phi_R(p^\mu)$ and $\phi_L(p^\mu) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha(x)} \phi_L(p^\mu)$ on $\phi_R(p^\mu)$ and $\phi_L(p^\mu)$, which appear in Dirac spinors (3), immediately introduces a gauge interaction [here a local $U(1)$]. On the other hand, for example, if one lets $\phi_L(p^\mu) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha(x)} \phi_L(p^\mu)$, then $\chi_R(p^\mu)$, introduced in (32) and which enters the definition of $\lambda(p^\mu)$, transforms into $e^{-i\alpha(x)} \chi_R(p^\mu)$. The transformed $\lambda(p^\mu)$, as is readily seen, is no longer a self-charge-conjugate spinor ¹¹.

From the point of view of phenomenological consequences, it is important to recall that recently a Bargmann-Wightman-Wigner-type quantum field theory has been successfully constructed [15] by us, with the result that one may now have a spin-1 boson and its antiboson with *opposite* relative intrinsic parities — *cf.*, $W^\pm$ of the standard model, where both the W^+ and W^- carry the *same* relative intrinsic parity. The Bargmann-Wightman-Wigner (BWW) bosons are not gauge bosons. If a neutrino is identified with the self/anti-self charge-conjugate representation space, then it may be coupled with the BWW bosons to generate physics beyond the present day gauge theories. An attractive feature of such a non-gauge theory construct is that both at the spin-1/2 and spin-1

¹¹The transformation $\lambda(p^\mu) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha(x)} \lambda(p^\mu)$ is also incompatible with the requirement of self/anti-self charge conjugacy.

level, the structure is purely a result of space-time symmetries, and hence has certain claim of “naturalness.” Precisely how the non-gauge part of the interaction lagrangian density for a system of interacting BWW bosons, self/anti-self charge conjugate neutrinos, charged leptons, and quarks is to be introduced from the first principles is not clear at the moment. One may, however, construct phenomenological interaction Lagrangian densities to guide experimentation and search for such a theoretical structure in the realm of elementary particle physics.

The BWW-field transforms as a $(1, 0) \oplus (0, 1)$ object under Lorentz transformations. The tentative experimental evidence for a tensor coupling in the $\pi^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \gamma$ decay [10] may already be a hint for the existence of a virtual BWW-boson involved in this process.

We now return to the question we asked in the beginning of the opening paragraph of this essay: Why doesn't the mirror reflection of the ordinary β -decay, $n \rightarrow p + e^- + \nu_\beta$, exist in the nature? The canonical understanding, it was pointed out, seeks understanding at the dynamical level. An equivalent kinematical answer is that ν_β is a Weyl particle. We find another possible kinematical answer to the question. In the discussion that follows, it should be remembered the neutrino would still enter the *standard* β -decay interaction Lagrangian density via the $2^{-1}(\mathbb{1} - \gamma^5)$ projection. It is this projection that destroys the self/anti-self charge conjugation and permits gauge interactions and helicity eigenstates by effectively reducing the neutrino to a Weyl particle.

In the usual way, we define the operation of parity in the space-time as $\mathcal{P} : x^\mu := (t, \mathbf{x}) \rightarrow x'^\mu := (t' = t, \mathbf{x}' = -\mathbf{x})$. Defining the operator that acts on $\lambda(p^\mu)$ in the wave equation (37) as $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{p})$, the parity covariance of the wave equation, $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{p}) \lambda(p^\mu) = 0$, demands that we seek an operator $S(\mathcal{P})$ such that under $\mathcal{P}$,

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{p}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{p}) = S(\mathcal{P}) \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{p}) [S(\mathcal{P})]^{-1}, \quad (42)$$

with $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{O}(\mathbf{p}' = -\mathbf{p})$. On observing that $\Theta_{[1/2]} \Xi = \Xi^{-1} \Theta_{[1/2]}$, such an operator (not surprisingly) is found to be

$$S(\mathcal{P}) = \exp(i\vartheta) \gamma^0, \quad \gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{1} \\ \mathbb{1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (43)$$

Working in the Weyl representation with $\vartheta_1 = 0 = \vartheta_2$, the action of $S(\mathcal{P})$ on the self/anti-self charge-conjugate $(1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representation space is immediately seen to contain an inherent kinematical asymmetry:

$$\gamma^0 \lambda_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) = -i \lambda_{\downarrow}^S(p'^\mu) , \quad \gamma^0 \lambda_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = +i \lambda_{\uparrow}^S(p'^\mu) , \quad (44)$$

$$\gamma^0 \lambda_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu) = +i \lambda_{\downarrow}^A(p'^\mu) , \quad \gamma^0 \lambda_{\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = -i \lambda_{\uparrow}^A(p'^\mu) , \quad (45)$$

(with similar expressions for $\rho^S(p^\mu)$ and $\rho^A(p^\mu)$) where p'^μ is the parity transformed energy momentum vector. As a consequence, if the β -decay neutrino ν_β is identified with $\rho_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu)$, then for $m = 0$, the parity-transformed ν_β identically vanishes. Purely at the kinematical level and within the framework of the theory of the kinematically asymmetric neutrino presented in this essay, the $n \rightarrow p + e^- + \nu_\beta$ has no mirror reflection for massless ν_β . The same statement holds true at the field theoretic level.

We now recall that the β -decay was chosen to provide an appropriate context only. The essential result can however be stated in more general terms as follows. The formalism based on the self/anti-self charge-conjugate construct presented in this paper shares a kinematical asymmetry with the Weyl construct *but* stands in a class by itself because of the remarkable fact that the requirement of self/anti-self charge conjugacy precludes eigenstates of definite helicity, even for the massless particles. Because of the indicated kinematical asymmetry, the theory automatically violates parity¹², and one is tempted to conclude that in a certain sense, violation of parity is a direct consequence of the self/anti-self charge-conjugate structure inherent in space-time symmetries *and* massless particles may exist in helicity eigenstates as long as parity is conserved. However, we hasten to point out that the parity violation inherent in our description goes beyond the existing phenomenology. At the level of existing empirical information, nothing beyond the $V - A$ Lorentz structure of the standard model is strongly hinted, and this in turn may essentially rob the present formalism of all its

¹²Another simple way to reach this conclusion is to appreciate that the self/anti-self charge-conjugate construct effectively involves superimposing states with opposite relative intrinsic parities. This leads to parity violation.

physical content if future experiments find no need for a structure beyond the standard model. The origin of these results apart from the already discussed fine interplay between the Wigner's boost, Wigner's time-reversal operator, and the role that Wigner's time reversal operator plays in the operation of charge conjugation, lies in the fact that in some yet-understood fashion, the operations of charge conjugation, $\mathcal{C}$, and Parity, $\mathcal{P}$, do not treat $\mathcal{R}$ - and $\mathcal{L}$ -coordinate systems in a symmetrical fashion. In the absence of some such speculative reason, we find it difficult to understand our results in their totality. Specifically, we observe that $(1/2, 0)_{\mathcal{L}} \oplus (0, 1/2)_{\mathcal{R}} \rightarrow (1/2, 0)_{\mathcal{R}} \oplus (0, 1/2)_{\mathcal{L}}$ under the parity transformation. This observation is consistent with the operation of parity as presented in Eq. (45) and identities noted in Eq. (39). Equations (45) and (39) when coupled yield:

$$\gamma^0 \lambda_{\uparrow}^S(p^\mu) = \rho_{\uparrow}^A(p'^\mu) , \quad \gamma^0 \lambda_{\downarrow}^S(p^\mu) = \rho_{\downarrow}^A(p'^\mu) , \quad (46)$$

$$\gamma^0 \lambda_{\uparrow}^A(p^\mu) = \rho_{\uparrow}^S(p'^\mu) , \quad \gamma^0 \lambda_{\downarrow}^A(p^\mu) = \rho_{\downarrow}^S(p'^\mu) . \quad (47)$$

The objects in the left hand side of the above equations are in $(1/2, 0)_{\mathcal{L}} \oplus (0, 1/2)_{\mathcal{R}}$ representation space and the objects on the right hand side belong to the $(1/2, 0)_{\mathcal{R}} \oplus (0, 1/2)_{\mathcal{L}}$ representation space.

To summarize, we note that we have established incompatibility of the simultaneous existence of self/anti-self charge conjugacy and helicity eigenstates for spin-1/2 particles. The self/anti-self charge conjugate construct presented in this essay was shown to contain an intrinsic kinematical asymmetry. Within the context of our present formalism one, cannot introduce gauge interaction in the standard fashion. The possibility that the physics beyond the standard model may be contained in self/anti-self charge-conjugate neutrinos, without the $2^{-1} (\mathbb{1} - \gamma^5)$ projection in the interaction Lagrangian density that effectively destroys the self/anti-self charge conjugacy, interacting with the spin-1 BWW bosons, was raised. The essential thesis of this essay is that there exists a new class of theories that are not gauge theories but derive their essential kinematical and dynamical content purely from space-time symmetries. In the specific construct considered in this essay, parity violation emerges as an intrinsic kinematical aspect of self/anti-self charge-conjugate structure in space time.

TABLES

TABLE I. Bi-orthonormality relations associated with $\lambda^S(p^\mu)$ and $\lambda^A(p^\mu)$ for general values of ϑ_1 and ϑ_2 . The value of $\bar{\lambda}_{\eta'}(p^\mu) \lambda_{\eta''}(p^\mu)$ is tabulated at the intersection of appropriate row and column. By definition $\bar{\lambda}_\eta(p^\mu) := \lambda_\eta^\dagger(p^\mu) \gamma^0$.

	$\lambda_\uparrow^S(p^\mu)$	$\lambda_\downarrow^S(p^\mu)$	$\lambda_\uparrow^A(p^\mu)$	$\lambda_\downarrow^A(p^\mu)$
$\bar{\lambda}_\uparrow^S(p^\mu)$	0	$2iN^2 \cos(\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2)$	0	$-2N^2 \sin(\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2)$
$\bar{\lambda}_\downarrow^S(p^\mu)$	$-2iN^2 \cos(\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2)$	0	$2N^2 \sin(\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2)$	0
$\bar{\lambda}_\uparrow^A(p^\mu)$	0	$2N^2 \sin(\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2)$	0	$-2iN^2 \cos(\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2)$
$\bar{\lambda}_\downarrow^A(p^\mu)$	$-2N^2 \sin(\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2)$	0	$2iN^2 \cos(\vartheta_1 + \vartheta_2)$	0

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Mikkel Johnson and Terry Goldman have been constant sounding boards, I thank them for their encouragement and accessibility. The question contained in the paragraph on Stern-Gerlach type experiments was asked by Cy Hoffman. The answer was composed in the ensuing discussion. I thank Cy for this, and many other questions he has asked during the course of this and other works. I also thank Peter Herczeg and Hywel White for several enlightening discussions on theoretical and experimental matters of direct relevance to the subject at hand. Professor Pierre Ramond directed me to Ref. [20]; I thank him kindly. I thank the library of Los Alamos National Laboratory for providing the English translation of the classic 1937 papers of E. Majorana and G. Racah. *This work was done under the auspices of the U. S. Department of Energy.*

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Majorana, *Nuovo Cimento* **14**, 171 (1937). For an English translation of this classic work, the reader should refer to technical translation TT-542, National Research Council of Canada. The reader may also contact the author to obtain a copy of the English translation of this and Racah's paper [2] for personal use.
- [2] G. Racah, *Nuovo Cimento* **14**, 322 (1937).
- [3] B. Kayser, F. Gibrat-Debu, and F. Perrier, *The Physics of Massive Neutrinos* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989); B. Kayser, *Phys. Rev. D* **30**, 1023 (1984);
B. Kayser, private communication (Fall, 1993).
- [4] W. Fetscher, H.-J. Gerber and K. F. Johnson, *Phys. Lett. B* **173**, 102 (1986).
Also see: C. Greub, D. Wyler, and W. Fetscher, *Phys. Lett. B* **324**, 109 (1994); and *Precision Tests of the Standard Model*, ed. P. Langacker (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993).
- [5] **Homestake:** R. Davis, Jr., in *Neutrino 88*, Proceedings of the XIIIth International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, Boston, Massachusetts, 1988, edited by J. Schneps *et al.* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).
Kamiokande II: K. Hirata *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 16 (1989); **65**, 1297 (1990); **65**, 1301 (1990).
Gallium experiments: P. Anselmann *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **285**, 390 (1992); **314**, 445 (1993);
A. I. Abazov *et al.* *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 3332 (1991).
- [6] W. Stoeffl and D. J. Decman, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory preprint UCRL-JC-115771.
- [7] R. G. H. Robertson *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 957 (1991); Ch. Weinheimer *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **300**, 210 (1993).

- [8] A. Balysh *et al.*, Phys. Lett B **283**, 32 (1992).
- [9] X-Q. Lu *et al.*, “A Proposal to Search for Neutrino Oscillations with High Sensitivity in Appearance Channels $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_e$,” Los Alamos National Laboratory report, LA-11842-P/University of California report UC-410, (1990).
- [10] V. N. Bolotov *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **243**, 308 (1990).
- [11] See, for example, D. I. Britton *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D. **49**, 28 (1994).
- [12] E. P. Wigner, Ann. Math. **40**, 149 (1939).
- [13] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **133**, B1318 (1964).
- [14] L. H. Ryder, *Quantum Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1987).
- [15] D. V. Ahluwalia, M. B. Johnson, and T. Goldman, Phys. Lett. B **316**, 102 (1993).
- [16] P. Ramond, *Field Theory: A Modern Primer* (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc., California, 1989); Section 1.4.
Also see: L. S. Brown, *Quantum Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1992) Section 7.2; P. Roman, *Theory of Elementary Particles* (North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1961), Section 4.g; and Ref. [21] below.
- [17] D. V. Ahluwalia, M. B. Johnson and T. Goldman, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **9**, 439 (1994).
- [18] J. D. Bjorken and S. D. Drell, *Relativistic Quantum Mechanics* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1964).
- [19] J. A. McLennan, Jr., Phys. Rev. **106**, 821 (1957).
- [20] K. M. Case, Phys. Rev. **107**, 307 (1957).
- [21] R. E. Marshak, Riazuddin, and C. P. Ryan, *Theory of Weak Interactions* (Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1969), pp. 66-73.

- [22] D. V. Ahluwalia and M. Sawicki, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 5161 (1993);
M. Sawicki and D. V. Ahluwalia, Los Alamos National Laboratory preprint LA-UR-93-4317; hep-th/9312092.
- [23] E. P. Wigner, in *Group Theoretical Concepts and Methods in Elementary Particle Physics Physics – Lectures of the Istanbul Summer School of Theoretical Physics, 1962*, edited by F. Gürsey;
Also see: Z. K. Silagadze, Yad. Fiz. **55**, 707 (1992) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **55**, 392 (1992)].
- [24] D. V. Ahluwalia and T. Goldman, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **8**, 2623 (1993).